

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address (\*\* AND 4) digital of (A) ED-19 AND TRADEMARKS Washington 10 (\* 2024) www.cisptogoa

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09 591,737	37 06 12 2000		David I Curiel	D616°CIP	3628
27851	2590	12 24 2002			
BENJAMIN	I A. ADLF	ER	EXAMINER		
8011 CANDLE LANE HOUSTON, TX - 77071				LI, QIAN J	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1632	
				DATE MAILÉD: 12-24-2002	13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/591,737	CURIEL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Q. Janice Li	1632		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 December 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment would raise new issues, e.g. under 35 USC 2, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2nd paragraphs, double patenting, and perhaps under 35 USC101, thus, require further search and consideration. The proposed amendment of claims 11 and 17 broadened the scope of claims to include ex vivo gene therapy method. The proposed amendment of claims 15, 19, 23, 41, 44, 54, and 56 lack antecedent basis. The proposed amendment of claims 21 and 43 causes these claims to be duplication of claims 17 and 40, respectively.

Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments toward rejections under 35 USC 112 1st paragraph, and Double Patenting are drawn to proposed amendment to claims. Since the amendment will not be entered, the arguments are moot. It is noted that under Double Patenting section, the proposed amendment and arguments are drawn to the subject matter of claims 31 and 33, whereas the rejection covers more claims, e.g. claims 1, 3-10, 25, and 26.

DEBORAH J. REVNOLDS

SUPERVISORY PARENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600